



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,532	01/16/2002	Victoria M.E. Bellotti	110143	7732

27074 7590 02/07/2007
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/07/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/07/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com
jarmstrong@oliff.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/683,532	BELLOTTI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Azizul Choudhury	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 November 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on November 16, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Implementation of a Workflow-based Web Application with an Electronic Signature Mechanism," by KIM, HyounghJun et al, hereafter referred to as Kim.

1. With regards to claims 1 and 10, Kim teaches a method for transmitting workflow-enabled electronic mail message from a user of a workflow system to a recipient, comprising: creating an email message to the recipient by the user, the recipient who does not have access to the workflow system (It is inherent that since email is sent, it is created; p. 4, left column, last paragraph, Kim); determining a network address (p. 4, right column, function 3, Kim); embedding a link to the determined network address in the email message to the recipient (p. 3, left column, 1st paragraph); associating a process of the workflow system with the determined network address (p. 4, right column, function 3, Kim); and

sending the email message having the link to the determined network address to the recipient, wherein the link provides the recipient with an access to the associated process of the workflow system (p. 3, left column, 1st paragraph and p. 2, right column, lines 9-22, Kim).

(While Kim does not explicitly cite that the recipient does not have access to the workflow system prior to receipt of the email, Kim does teach that only authenticated users can access the documents (document is in workflow system) (p. 4, section 3.3, 1st column, 2nd function, Kim). In addition, Kim does cite that users are authenticated (p. 4, section 3.3, Kim). Official notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that since only authenticated users are able to access a document and that authentication is based on email addresses and also that access to the document is achieved through a URL embedded within an email received by the recipient (p. 3, left column, 1st paragraph and p. 2, right column, lines 9-22, Kim), that means are present within Kim's design for creating an email to the recipient who does not have access to a workflow system).

2. With regards to claims 2 and 11, Kim teaches the method wherein determining the network address comprises selecting the network address from a list of predefined network addresses (p. 3, right column, section "Standard Roadmap and Database Module," Kim).

3. With regards to claims 3 and 12, Kim teaches the method wherein determining the network address comprises generating the network address (p. 4, right column, function 3, Kim).
4. With regards to claims 4 and 13, Kim teaches the method wherein generating the network address comprises randomly or pseudo-randomly generating the network address (p. 2, 2nd column, lines 25-43 and p. 3, 1st column, lines 2-4, Kim).
5. With regards to claims 5 and 14, Kim teaches the method wherein generating the network address comprises generating the network address based on at least in part on information about at least one of at least the created email message, the recipient, the workflow process and the user (p. 2, 2nd column, lines 25-43 and p. 3, 1st column, lines 2-4, Kim).
6. With regards to claims 6 and 15, Kim teaches the method further comprising associating the determined network address with the email message (Figure 2, Kim).
7. With regards to claims 7 and 16, Kim teaches the method wherein associating the determined network address with the email message comprises associating an email address of the recipient to which the created email will be sent with the

determined network address (It is inherent that an email address of the recipient must be attached to an email if the email is to be sent).

8. With regards to claims 8, 17, 18 and 19, Kim teaches the method wherein:

determining a network address comprises determining a plurality of different network addresses (p. 3, section "Standard Roadmap and Database Module," Kim); and embedding a link to the determined network address into the email message to the recipient comprises embedding a plurality of links into the email message, each link being to one of the plurality of determined network addresses (p. 3, left column, 1st paragraph, Kim).

(While Kim does not specifically cite the embedding of multiple links within a single email, Official notice is hereby taken that it is well known in the art, that a plurality of links can be embedded within an email, for the purpose of sending multiple links without using multiple messages).

9. With regards to claims 9 and 20, Kim teaches the method wherein associating a process of the workflow system with the determined network address comprises associating a different state of the associated process of the workflow system with each of the plurality of determined network addresses (p. 4, right column, function 3 and component 3, Kim).

(While Kim does not specifically cite the embedding of multiple links within a single email, Official notice is hereby taken that it is well known in the art, that a

plurality of links can be embedded within an email, for the purpose of sending multiple links without using multiple messages).

10. With regards to claim 21, Kim teaches a method for accessing a workflow process using a workflow-enabled email message, comprising: receiving the workflow-enabled email message that includes a link to a network address associated with the workflow process, wherein the network address is specific to the workflow process and to the email message; selecting the link to access the network address, wherein, in response, the workflow system provides access to the workflow process (p. 3, left column, 1st paragraph and p. 2, right column, lines 9-22, Kim).
11. With regards to claim 22, Kim teaches the method further comprising: receiving a request to provide authentication from the workflow system in response to selecting the link; and providing the requested authentication to the workflow system, the workflow system denying access to the workflow process if the requested authentication is not valid (p. 4, right column, component 4, Kim).
12. With regards to claim 25, Kim teaches the method wherein determining the network address further comprises: excluding generated network addresses that have previously been embedded in any previous email messages created by the system that have not yet been accessed (p. 2, 2nd column, lines 25-43, Kim).

13. The motivation applied in claims 1 and 10 are applicable to claims 2-9, 11-22 and
25

Remarks

The amendment received on November 16, 2006 has been carefully examined but is not deemed fully persuasive. The following are the examiner's responses to the remarks presented within the amendment.

The first point of contention addressed by the applicant concerns the "transmitting workflow-enabled electronic mail messages from a user of a workflow system to a recipient, in which the recipient does not have access to the workflow system." The applicant asserts that the Kim prior art does not teach such a trait and that the examiner's interpretation of the art is erroneous. The examiner disagrees with these assertions and maintains that Kim does teach such a trait. Kim teaches an email workflow system in which only authenticated users can access the documents (document is in workflow system) (p. 4, section 3.3, 1st column, 2nd function, Kim). The disclosure does not explicitly cite that the recipient does not have access to the workflow system prior to receipt of the email however, in Kim's design, a user does not have access to the document within the workflow (hence the user does not have access to the workflow system) until they are authenticated. The user is first authenticated based on email addresses. The user then receives an email with a URL embedded within it granting them access to the document (access to the workflow system) (p. 3,

Art Unit: 2145

left column, 1st paragraph and p. 2, right column, lines 9-22, Kim). Hence, the user only gains access to the workflow system after going through the URL within the email. Prior to clicking on the URL, the user has no access to the workflow system. These features of Kim's design are deemed equivalent to the claimed traits.

The second point of contention addressed by the applicant concerns the trait of "sending the email message having a link to the determined network address to the recipient, wherein the link provides the recipient with access to the associated process of the workflow system." The applicant contends that the prior art does not teach such a trait. The examiner disagrees with this assertion. Kim teaches that users can access the documents (equivalent to associated process of the workflow system) through a URL (p. 4, section 3.3, 1st column, 2nd function, Kim).

The third point of contention addressed by the applicant concerns claims 4-5, and 13-14. The applicant contends that the Kim art does not teach the randomly or pseudo-randomly generating of network addresses. The examiner disagrees with this assertion. Kim teaches this trait in p. 2, 2nd column, lines 25-43 and p. 3, 1st column, lines 2-4. It is taught

The fourth point of contention involves the concept of embedding more than one link within an email. The applicant contends that Kim does not teach such a feature and is not capable of supporting such a feature. While Kim does not teach such a feature, it is well known in the art and Official Notice is being taken by the examiner to state that the concept of embedding a plurality of links within an email is well known in the art. In

Art Unit: 2145

addition, the concept of embedding a plurality of links is not impossible within Kim's design since one link is already embedded within an email within the design.

The fifth point of contention involves the trait of "excluding generating network addresses that have been embedded in previous emails but have not been accessed." The applicant contends that Kim does not teach such a feature; the examiner disagrees. Kim teaches in the second column of page 2, within lines 25-40, that the data within the email (including the URL) can be encrypted to prevent it from being exposed. Hence, the URL within each email is unique.

Finally, the events of the in-person interview, which took place on November 8, 2006 between Examiner Choudhury, Mr. Golladay, Examiner Swearingen and Primary Examiner Winder had been summarized within the interview summary submitted on November 8, 2006. Various interpretations of the claim language and the prior art were shared between all parties and possible amendments were explored at that time, however no agreements were reached.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2145

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Azizul Choudhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AC


JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER